Appln. No. 10/737,339 Amendment dated July 30, 2007

Regarding Office Action dated July 20, 2007

Docket No.: 5853-365

I. REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of July 20, 2007 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. As a result of this Amendment, claims 4, 5, and 6 have been amended.

The Examiner objected to claims 4, 5, and 6 for minor informalities which have been corrected. Further note, the second occurrence of "number" does not refer back to the prior "number". Therefore, no change is required in this regard.

In paragraph 2, at page 2 of the Office Action, Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the claimed embodiments. Appropriate correction has been made to overcome the antecedent basis problem.

II. The Claims Define Over the Prior Art

In paragraph 4, the Examiner noted that claim 6 would be allowable if amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. section 112, second paragraph. In paragraph 5, the Examiner found claims 1-5 and 7-14 as allowed.

The Applicant further notes that the reasons for allowance are applicable to claims 1-9. Although claims 10-14 are similar, these claims do not specifically recite Hermitian symmetry. Nonetheless, these claims should also be deemed allowable since claim 10 takes Fourier-transformed signals from a first output to an output signal having half of an FFT size and then calculates the signal-to-noise ratio for each subcarrier with six signals from six Fourier-transformed blocks for the same sub-carrier.

Appln. No. 10/737,339

Amendment dated July 30, 2007 Regarding Office Action dated July 20, 2007

Docket No.: 5853-365

IV. CONCLUSION

The claims have been amended for minor informalities and have not been amended to overcome any cited art. Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance. Allowance is therefore respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: July 30, 2007

/Pablo Meles/
Pablo Meles, Reg. No. 33,739
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Customer No. 30448
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach. FL 33402-3188

Telephone: (954) 463-2700